31st March 1958]

Appendix IV.

[Vide item IV (1) on page 313 supra.]

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES ON THE QUESTION WHETHER THE PUBLICATION OF THE PAMPHLET 'WHAT HAPPENED IN MUDUKALATHUR' CONSTITUTED A BREACH OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE.

To

The Honourable The LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
MADRAS.

I

Introduction and Procedure.

I, the Chairman of the Committee of Privileges present this report to the House on the question of breach of privilege, namely the action of the Director of Information and Publicity in publishing the pamphlet entitled 'What happened in Mudukalathur?' முதுகளத்தூரில் நடந்தது என்ன ?

The question was raised by Sri M. Kalyanasundaram at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly on the 16th November 1957, and was referred to the Committee of Privileges for examination and report, by the Speaker *suo motu* under Rule 187 of the Madras Assembly Rules on the 10th February 1958.

The Committee held six sittings.

At its first sitting on the 14th February 1958, a note was circulated by the Secretary setting out the facts of the case and the law and practice on the subject.

The Committee heard Sri M. Kalyanasundaram at its meetings on the 24th February 1958 and 5th March 1958 and the Director of Information and Publicity at its meeting on the 17th March 1958.

As its last sitting on the 28th March 1958 the Committee deliberated on the draft report and adopted it with certain modifications.

II

Facts and the Case.

On 15th November 1957, as requested by the Director of Information and Publicity, Madras, copies of the pamphlet முதுகளத்தூரில் நடந்தது என்ன ? (What happened in Mudukulathur?) were distributed to the Members of the Legislative Assembly. On the 16th November 1957, the last day of the sitting of the Assembly in November 1957, Sri M. Kalyanasundaram, M.L.A., gave notice of a privilege motion that the action of the Director of Information and Publicity and the Minister in-charge of Publicity and Information in having published this pamphlet, which contained a lot of distortions and wilful misrepresentations calculated to scandalise the Opposition parties, constituted a breach of privilege and might be referred to the Committee of

Privileges. The Hon. Speaker said that as this was raised on the last day, he would have to consider the matter carefully and therefore he would give his ruling when the Assembly met next.

At the meeting of the Legislative Assembly on 10th February 1958 the Speaker gave his decision that *prima facie* this was a case which should go to the Privileges Committee and referred the matter to the Committee suo motu for examination and report under Rule 187 of the Madras Assembly Rules instead of deciding it himself.

III.

FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

The privileges conferred on the State Legislature by the Constitution are as follows :—

Article 194.—(1) Subject to the provisions of this Constitution and to the rules and standing orders regulating the procedure of the Legislature, there shall be freedom of speech in the Legislature of every State.

(2) No member of the Legislature of a State shall be liable to any proceedings in any Court in respect of anything said or any vote given by him in the Legislature or any Committee thereof, and no person shall be so liable in respect of the publication by or under the authority of a House of such a Legislature of any report, paper, votes or proceedings.

(3) In other respects, the powers, privileges and immunites of a House of the Legislature of a State, and of the members and the Committees of a House of such Legislature, shall be such as may from time to time be defined by the Legislature by law, and until so defined, shall be those of the House of Commons of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and of its Members and Committees at the commencement of this Constitution.

The principles governing the publication of the debates outside Parliament and the publication of his own speech by a Member apart from the rest of the debate have been detailed in ruling by the Speaker and the note circulated to the Members of the Committee.

In the course of his evidence Sri M. Kalyanasundaram stated that in his view the Director of Information and Publicity could not have published this pamphlet *suo motu* and the move should have come only from Minister concerned. He also stated that there was no misrepresentation of facts but of the proceedings in the Assembly; that the publication should have contained all the speeches of all the Members and without omitting the interruptions. But he admits that the language of the speech has not been altered. In his opinion the preface is the most objectionable portion, because it gives the impression that what the two Ministers spoke on the floor of the Assembly alone are true, and that what other members spoke on the floor of the Assembly are untrue, an insinuation against other members of the House who spoke contrary to what was spoken by the Hon. Ministers.

31st March 1958]

It may be contended, no doubt, that the preface does not refer specifically to the speeches by Members of the Legislature. But it may lead to an inference that only the Ministers speeches represent facts and speeches by others do not and in so far as they contain replies to the points raised by them in their speeches in the House, the preface may be held to reflect on the Members of the Assembly though not named who made those speeches.

It has long been recognized that the publication of imputations reflecting on the dignity of the House or of any Member in his capacity as such is punishable as a contempt of Parliament. The imputation upon a member to come within this principle must relate to sômething which he has done as such, that is to say, incidentally to and part of his service to Parliament. Reflections upon Members however, even where individuals are not named may be so framed as to bring into disrepute the body to which they belong, and such reflections have therefore, been treated as equivalent to reflections on the House itself.

The general effect of the evidence by the Director of Information and Publicity was a refutation of the suggestion that Members were involved, that the pamphlet was brought out only in his capacity as the Director of Information and Publicity without any instructions from the Minister concerned, that his intention was only to present the official version about the incidents in Ramanathapuram about which conflecting versions had been given with a view to set at rest the confusion created in the minds of the people, and that it was not intended to refer to the speech of any member in the Assembly. He also stated that the preface was mainly intended to introduce the pamphlet to the public explaining the need for it, namely, to bring to light matters which were true and never intended to pass any remarks about the speech of any member in the Assembly. To put it briefly, the substance of his evidence was that the publication was in good faith and was not intended to cause reflection upon the members much less, to scandalize the Opposition Parties.

The Committee therefore accepts the statement of the Director of Information and Publicity that it was published only in the course of the discharge of his official duties and not intended to cause any reflection on the veracity of the speeches of the members who took part in the debate to which Finance Minister replied and that in fact that he had not in view such speeches when he wrote the preface.

The Committee has also gone through the report and holds that the said reporting and publication was not complete. But if this had been published without the preface, there would have been very litle ground to take any serious view of such incomplete publication of the proceedings of the House. The Committee is therefore of the opinion that as far as the publication is concerned no motive can be attributed to the Director who has been responsible for issuing the same. It would have been fair on his part to have reported the proceedings of the Assembly in full.

[31st March 1958

The Committee also desires in order that no mala fide intention might be attributed such reports of speeches made in the House should be published without any comments.

It was also elicited from the Director that he was not publishing the pamphlet as a verbatim report of the Proceedings of the House and the publication of the speech of the Finance Minister presenting the Budget for 1957-58 under the title "நாடு செழிக்க" was pointed out as an instance. In the preface it is stated that the pamphlet contains the statement by the Home Minister and the reply by the Finance Minister to the No-confidence motion in the Assembly. His contention was that he was thereby giving the source or basis of the publication and did not intend to refer to any of the speeches of the Members. But so far as it is a verbatim report of the proceedings except for the omission of the interruptions and minor alterations, it cannot be denied that it has to be taken as a speech by a member published apart from the rest of the debate.

There is a distinction between the absolute privilege of members speaking in the House or in any Committee of the House and the qualified privilege of a publisher reporting words spoken; in the latter case, publication of parliamentary proceedings is protected not specifically by privilege of Parliament but on the analogy of the publication of proceedings in courts of justice, viz., the occasional inconvenience to individuals arising from it must yield to the general good. A fair and faithful report would not therefore be actionable. But a garbled or partial report or of detached parts of proceedings published with intent to injure individuals will be disentitled to protection.

When a matter of complaint of breach of privileges is referred to a Committee, such Committee has, and always, has had, power to inquire not only into the matter of the particular complaint but also into facts surrounding and reasonably connected with the matter of the particular complaint and into the principles of law and custom of privilege that are concerned. And this, the Committee has done in this case.

Whilst recognising that it is the duty of the House to intervene in case of attacks which may tend to undermine public confidence in and support of the institution of the Assembly itself, this Committee is of opinion that it is important that the law of Parliamentary privilege should not be admistered in a way which would fetter or discourage the free expression of opinion or criticism, however prejudiced or exaggerated such opinion or criticism may be, and the process of parliamentary investigation should not be used in a way which would give importance to irresponsible statements.

The Committee also understands that the publication has been withdrawn from circulation.

After giving due consideration to all aspects of the question, this Committee is convinced that the publication of this pamphlet was not intended to scandalise the opposition parties and that no

31st March 1958]

wilful distortions or misrepresentations are made out. The Committee accordingly feels that no further action is called for and recommends that the case should be closed.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
MADRAS-9.
28th March 1958.

K. RAMACHANDRAN,
Chairman.

ANNEXURE I.

LETTER FROM SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM, M.L.A., TO THE HON. THE SPEAKER, LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, MADRAS, DATED 16TH NOVEMBER 1957.

I beg to move that the action of the Director of Publicity and the Minister in charge of Publicity and Information, in publishing the pamphlet under the title " What happened in Mudukkulathur "? "முதுகுளத்தூரில் நடந்தது என்ன ?" in Tamil, constitute a breach of privilege of the House and I request that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

This pamphlet has been published by the Director of Information and Publicity with the knowledge and consent of the Hon. Minister in charge of publicity. This pamphlet contains the statement made by the Hon. Home Minister on the floor of the Assembly regarding the alleged communal disturbances in Mudukulathur, Ramanathapuram district, and the speech of the Hon. Minister for Finance during the debate on the motion of No-confidence in the Ministry.

This pamphlet contains lot of distortions and wilful misrepresentations calculated to scandalise the Opposition parties.

I therefore request that the matter may kindly be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

ANNEXURE II.

RULING GIVEN BY HON. THE SPEAKER ON THE 10TH FEBRUARY 1958.

The House will remember that at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly on the 16th November 1957, the last day of the sittings of the Assembly in November 1957 Sri M. Kalyanasundaram, M.L.A., gave a notice of a Privilege Motion that the action of the Director of Informaiton and Publicity and the Minister in-charge of Publicity and Information in publishing the pamphlet under the title "முதுகளத்தூரில் நடந்தது என்ன ?" in Tamil constituted a breach of privilege of the House as that pamphlet contained a lot of distortions and wilful misrepresentations calculated to scandalise the Opposition parties. I promised to look into the allegations, and give my decision at this meeting.

2. The pamphlet consists of three parts, viz., (1) a Preface by the Director of Information and Publicity, (2) the Statement made by the Hon. Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam, Minister for Home, on the Ramanathapuram district disturbances translated into Tamil from English, and (3) the Speech of Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam, Leader

[31st March 1958

of the House, replying to the debate on the No-confidence motion. A Tamil translation of the statement by the Minister for Home was also circulated to the Members already.

3. Under Article 194 of the Constitution, the privileges conferred on the State Legislature are as follows :—

(1) Subject to the provisions of this Constitution and to the rules and standing orders regulating the procedure of the Legislature, there shall be freedom of speech in the Legislature of every State.

(2) No member of the Legislature of a State shall be liable to any proceedings in any court in respect of anything said or any vote given by him in the Legislature or any committee thereof, and no person shall be so liable in respect of the publication by or under the authority of a House of such a Legislature of any report, paper, votes or proceedings.

(3) In other respects, the powers, privileges and immunities of a House of the Legislature of a State, and of the members and the committees of a House of such Legislature shall be such as may from time to time be defined by the Legislature by law, and until so defined, shall be those of the House of Commons of the Parliament of the United Kingdom and of its members and committees, at the commencement of this Constitution.

In so far as the privileges of the State Legislature have not been defined by law, its privileges shall be those of the House of Commons in the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Even in the United Kingdom they have not been defined by statute and the question of privilges are decided with reference to conventions and precedents evolved over some centuries.

4. In the Madras Legislative Assembly in October 1950-51, some Members requested the permission of the Chair to print their own speeches for election purposes.

In England a practice is obtaining according to which—

"Reprints of particular speeches in leaflet forms may be obtained by members on application to the Editor on payment to H.M. Stationery Office of a fee based on the cost of production." The inner cover of each Hansard pamphlet contains the following sentence :—

"Members may obtain excerpts of their speeches from the Official Report (within one month from date of publication), on application to the Controller of H.M. Stationery Office."

But when the members got their speeches printed, they do so at their own risk. As pointed out by May—

"Although the privilege of freedom of speech protects what is said in debate in either House, this privilege does not protect the publication of debate outside Parliament. Nor does an order of the House for their printing and publication confer parliamentary pivileges on proceedings published outside Parliament. A Member who publishes his speech made in either House *separately from the rest of the debate* is responsible for any libellous matter it may

31st March 1958]

contain under the common law rules as to defamation of character. But the publication, whether by order of the House or not, of a fair and faithful account of a debate in either House of Parliament is protected by the same principle as that which protects fair reports of proceedings in courts of justice, namely, that the advantage to the public negatives the presumption of malice and outweighs any disadvantage to individuals."

The Speaker, therefore, informed the House that the publication of excerpts of speeches by the Members themselves did not require the permission of Chair but such publication would not have the privilege of freedom of speech which the Member had in respect of his speech within the House.

5. Even this privilege is offered to the publication of parliamentary proceedings on the same principle as is applied to the case of reports of judicial proceedings and is, accordingly, subject to the same limitations as apply to reports of judicial proceedings. It follows, therefore, that a garbled or partial report or a report of detached parts of proceedings, published with intent to injure individuals will, as in the case of reports of judicial proceedings, be disentitled to protection.

On the same principle, a *bona fide* publication of a defamatory speech by a member for the information of his constituents is privileged, but the publication by a member in a newspaper of a single defamatory speech in Parliament, for the purpose of injuring an individual, would not be entitled to any privilege.

6. I would draw the attention of this House to the following quotations in this connection :—

"The English Courts draw a short line between the speech within the House and its publication without. In 1798, it was held by the Court of King's Bench in the case of *Rex* v. *Abingdon* (1 Espinasse, 226) that a Member of Parliament might have a right to publish his speech but that the speech must not be made the vehicle of slander against any individual; if this was done an action of libel would lie for its publication. A similar judgment was pronounced in 1813 in the case of a well-known Member of Parliament, Mr. Creevy. On this occasion, the House absolutely refused to interfere or to treat the matter as a question of privilege." (*Robert Luce—" Legis. Procedure "*, p. 327. *Also May*, *p.* 55.)

"It is now sound doctrine that a publication by a Member of the House of Commons of a report of his speech, *bona fide* addressed to his constituents, would be privileged. The privilege in such a case would arise because the publication is as a communication between a member and his constituents, and not because it is a true report of what took place in Parliament. Also it is now laid down that that reprinting of a speech which reflects upon the character of any person, without, adding the rest of the debate. is not 'fair' and is therefore unprotected; no doubt it would be otherwise if the whole debate were given" (*Robert Luce—" Legis. Procedure "*, p.328.)

[31st March 1958

"If a Member publishes his own speech, reflecting upon the character of another person, and omits to publish the rest of the debates, the publication would not be fair and so would not be privileged, but a fair and faithful report of the whole debate would not be actionable."

"There is obviously a material difference between the publication of a speech made in Parliament for the express purpose of attacking the conduct of an individual, and afterwards published with a like purpose or effect, and the faithful publication of Parliamentary reports in their entirety, with a view to afford information to the public, and with a total absence of hostile intention or malicious motive towards any one." [*Watson* v. *Walter* (1868) Q.B.]

7. So long, therefore, as the debates are correctly and faithfully reported, the privilege which protects their publication is waived but when they are reported *mala fide*, the publishers of newspapers are liable to censure.

Similarly, an article founded on proceedings in Parliament would be privileged, if it is an honest and fair comment on the facts. Fair and accurate extracts, from authorized publications, would also be similarly privileged but the case is different when they are reported *mala fide*. Reflections upon Members, even where individuals are not named, may be so framed as to bring into disrepute the body to which they belong, and such reflections have, therefore, been treated as equivalent to reflections on the House itself.

These are broadly the principles governing the publications of debates outside Parliament.

8. Coming to the question of privilege at issue, I have compared the speeches as printed in the pamphlet in question with the verbatum reports as given by the Official Reports. All the interruptions and certain portions of the Finance Minister's reply have been omitted and there are also certain changes of a minor nature. Besides 'preface' has been defined in Webster's International Dictionary as "something spoken as introductory to a discourse or written as introductory to a book or the like, usually by way of explanation of the object, scope, etc., of the discourse or literary composition—an introduction, or series of preliminary remarks; a prologue; foreward". The preface to the pamphlet runs as follows :—

"முதுகுளத்தூரில் நடந்தது என்ன ? என்பது பற்றிப் பலரும் பல விதமாகப் பேசுகின்றார்கள். தனிப்பட்ட நோக்கங்களைக் குறிக்கோளாகக் கொண்டு உண்மையைத் திரித்துக் கூறிப் பொதுமக்களின் உள்ளத்திலே ற்பல பொய்யான எண்ணங்களை விதைத்து விடுகின்றனர். சிலர் எனவே உண்மையான நிலைமையைப் பொதுமக்கள் தெரிந்து கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்ற நோக்கத்தோடு இந்நூல் வெளியிடப்படுகிறது.

இராமநாதபுரம் மாவட்டத்தைச் சேர்ந்த முதுகுளத்தூரிலும் அதன் சுற்றுப்புறப் பகுதிகளிலும் அண்மையில் நடந்த வகுப்புக் கலவரங்கள், போலீஸ் நடவடிக்கைகள் பற்றி உள்நாட்டுத்துறை அமைச்சர் ஸ்ரீ எம். பக்தவத்சலம் அவர்கள் வெளியிட்ட அறிக்கையும், அதன் மீது நடைபெற்ற விவாதத்திற்கு விடையளித்த நிதி அமைச்சர் ஸ்ரீ சுப்பிரமணியம் அவர்களின் சொற்பொழிவும் இவ்வெளியீட்டில் அடங்கியுள்ளன."

31st March 1958]

To put it in English, it is stated that, for personal ends, some people misrepresent the facts about what happened in Mudukulathur and create wrong impressions in the minds of the public and that the pamphlet, which contains the statement of the Hon. Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam on "what happened in Mudukulathur" and the reply to the debate thereon by the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam, is issued with a view to acquainting the public with the true facts of the situation.

A possible inference from the preface might be that only the Ministers' speeches represent facts and speeches by others do not. It may be contended, no doubt, that it does not refer specifically to the speeches by Members of the Legislature, but in so far as they contain replies to the points raised by them in their speeches in the House, the preface could be held to reflect on the Members of the Assembly, though not named, who made those speeches.

It is presumably on these facts that it has been alleged that the publication is intended to scandalise the Opposition parties, but it is difficult to decide whether this was really so without a detailed examination of the portions omitted and the circumstances leading to this publication.

I do not wish to discuss the matter further at this stage. But *prima facie* I think this is a case which should go to the Privileges Committee. I have, therefore, preferred to refer this matter to the Committee of Privileges instead of deciding it myself. The Committee will go into the question as to how far the speech as contained in the pamphlet is a faithful report of the proceedings of the House and whether this publication constitutes a breach of privilege, and if so, what steps this House should take in this matter.

ANNEXURE III.

Written statement of Sri M. Kalyanasundaram Submitted to the Committee on the 5th March 1958.

I do not propose to make any further statement.

I have already stated how the publication in question amounts to a breach of privilege. In my opinion the preface is the most objectionable portion, because it gives the impression that what the two Ministers spoke on the floor of the Assembly alone are true. This means what other members spoke on the floor of the Assembly are untrue. In my opinion, it is an insinuation against other members of the House who spoke contrary to what was spoken by the Hon. Ministers.

If the author of the preface says what he intended at the time of writing the preface, and what he wanted to achieve by bringing out this pamphlet, I will be able to state further, if the Committee so desires.

I thank the Committee for the opportunity given to me.

[31st March 1958

ANNEXURE IV.

Note circulated to the Committee of Privileges.

On the 15th November 1957, as requested by the Director of Information and Publicity, Madras, copies of a pamphlet entitled முதுகளத்தூரில் நடந்தது என்ன ? (What happened in Mudukulathur?) were distributed to the Members of the Legislative Assembly. On the 16th November 1957, the last day of the sittings of the Assembly in November, Sri M. Kalyanasundaram, M.L.A., gave notice of a privilege motion that the action of the Director of Information and Publicity and the Minister in charge of Publicity and Information in having published this pamphlet, which contained a lot of distortions and wilful misrepresentations calculated to scandalise the Opposition parties, constituted a breach of privilege and might be referred to the Committee of Privileges. The Hon. Speaker said that as this was raised on the last day, he would have to consider the matter carefully and therefore he would give his ruling when the Assembly met next.

The pamphlet consists of three parts, viz., (1) a Preface by the Director of Information and Publicity, (2) the Statement made by the Hon. Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam, Minister (Tamil translation) for Home, on the Ramanathapuram district disturbances and (3) the Speech of the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam, Leader of the House, replying to the debate on the " No Confidence " motion.

The law, practice and precedents obtaining in the House of Commons relating to the publication of parliamentary debates and proceedings are set out in the following paragraphs :—

The absolute privilege of statements made in debate is no longer contested, but it may be observed that the privilege which formerly protected Members against action by the Crown now serves largely as protection against prosecution by individuals or corporate bodies. Subject to the rules of order in debate, a Member may state whatever he thinks fit in debate, *however offensive it may be to the feelings, or injurious to the character, of individuals, and he is* protected from any action for libel, as well as from any other question or molestation. (May 15th Edn., p. 51.)

The principles upon which the publication of reports of parliamentary debates and proceedings is privileged against actions in courts may be stated to be as follows :—

" Although the privilege of freedom of speech protects what is said in debate in either House, this privilege does not protect the publication of debate outside Parliament. Nor does an order of the House for their printing and publication confer parliamentary privilege on proceedings published outside Parliament. A Member who publishes his speech made in either House *separately from the rest of the debate* is responsible for any libellous matter it may contain under the common law rules as to defamation of character. But the publication, whether by order of the House or not, of a fair and faithful account of a debate in either House of Parliament

31st March 1958]

is protected by the same principle as that which protects fair reports of proceedings in courts of justice, namely, that the advantage to the public negatives the presumption of malice and outweighs any disadvantage to individuals. Statutory protection has been given,, by the Parliamentary Papers Act, 1840, to papers published by order of either House of Parliament from proceedings in any Court of Law." (May 15th Edn., p. 54.)

The House has the sole right to publish its own debates and proceedings. Though there is full freedom of speech within the walls of Parliament, the Members have no unqualified privilege of publishing their speeches outside Parliament. If a Member chooses to circulate outside the House, the speeches made by him in the House, he does so at his own peril and if they contain dafamatory matter he is liable to proceedings for libel as such a printed statement becomes a separate publication unconnected with any proceedings in Parliament.

Also, so long as the debates are correctly and faithfully reported the privilege which protects their publication is waived but when they are reported *mala fide* the publishers of newspapers are liable to censure.

On the same principle, an *article* founded on proceedings in Parliament would be privileged, if it is an *honest and fair comment on the facts.*

If a member publishes his own speech, reflecting upon the character of another person and omits to publish the rest of the debate, the publication would not be *fair* and so would not be privileged but a fair and faithful report of the whole debate would not be actionable.

A "There is obviously a material difference between the publication of a speech made in Parliament for the express purpose of attacking the conduct of an individual, and *afterwards published with a like purpose or effect*, and the faithful publication of Parliamentary papers in their entirety, with a view to afford information to the public, and with a total absence of hostile intention or malicious motive towards any one."

Under the practice in the House of Commons, publication under colour of a report of a Member's speech, a gross libel on the character and conduct of another Member is also an instance of misconduct in regard to the publication of debates which has been treated as a breach of privilege. (Case of Bell and Collier. 1819—Extracts appended.)

Reflections upon Members, even where individuals are not named, may be so framed as to bring into disrepute the body to which they belong, and such reflections have therefore been treated as equivalent to reflections on the House itself.

The question of privilege under consideration has been raised on the basis that the "pamphlet contains a lot of distortions and wilful misrepresentations calculated to scandalise the Opposition parties."

[31st March 1958

If it could be proved that the intention was actually to do so, it will come under the category of the last three instances stated at **A** above, viz.—

(1) Omission to publish the rest of the debates;

(2) publication under colour of a report of a Member's speech, a gross libel on the character and conduct of another Member; and

(3) reflections upon Members, even where individuals are not named, so framed as to bring into disrepute the body to which they belong.

EXTRACTS FROM THE JOURNAL OF HOUSE OF COMMONS RELATING TO CASE OF BELL AND COLLIER, 1819.

Page 533, *dated* 14*th June* 1819.

Complaint made of a newspaper.—Complaint being made to the House of a printed newspaper, intituled, "The Times", dated Wednesday, 9th June 1819, printed and published at the Office Printing House Square, near Apothecaries Hall, Blackfriars, by C. Bell, Burnswick street, as containing an account of a debate of this House, and a gross misrepresentation of a speech of one of its Members, and, under colour of the report of such speech, a publication of a scandalous libel on the character and conduct of another of its Members, in contempt of the orders, and in breach of privileges, of this House: The said paper was delivered in and read; and also, the Newspaper, intituled, "The Times", dated Monday, the 14th June, containing matter in extension of such report and corrected statement of the said speech.

Ordered, *Nemine contradicents*, That Mr. C. Bell do attend this House tomorrow.

Page 536/15*th June* 1919.—That the order of the date, for the attendance of Mr. C. Bell, be now read; and the same being read:

And the House being informed that the said Mr. C. Bell attended accordingly; he was called in; and the Newspaper, intituled, "The Times" printed and published by C. Bell (which paper was yesterday delivered in at the Table) was shown to him, when he stated that he was the printer and publisher of the said paper and that he had received the paragraph complained of from John Payne Collier; and then he withdrew.

And the House being informed that the said John Payne Collier was in attendance he was called in; and confessed that he was the author of the said paragraph and then he withdrew.

Resolved, that the said paragraph is a scandalous misrepresentation of the debates and proceedings of this House, a caluminous libel on the character of one of its Members and an aggravated breach of its privileges. Ordered, *Nemine contradicente*, that John Payne Collier, for his said offence, be commited to the custody of the Sergeant at Arms attending this House; and that Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant accordingly.

T. HANUMANTHAPPA,
Secretary.